

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated January 10, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

**Attorney docket number**

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner update the attorney docket number associated with the instant case to: 18133-112.

**35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections**

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-13, 15-16, and 18-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,711,613 (Ewing).

**Claim 1 and associated dependent claims**

Ewing does not teach, disclose, suggest, or make obvious a computer program product, as recited in claim 1, including instructions for causing a computer to provide geographic information that indicates a geographic location associated with a UPS. The Examiner cited col. 4, ll. 19-47, col. 5, l. 36 – col. 6, l. 51, and col. 8, l. 63 – col. 10, l. 48 as disclosing “provide geographic information associated with the indicia of changes in power 15 status that indicates a geographic location associated with the UPS.” (Office action dated 1/10/06, p. 4). The portions of Ewing cited by the Examiner discuss “providing power supply status and control in network nodes at geographically distant locations.” Col. 4, ll. 20-21. When a problem at a remote node is detected, an alarm is issued that identifies the problem by type and node address. *Id.*, col. 8, ll. 65-68. The cited portions of Ewing, however, do not disclose providing geographic information that indicates a geographic location associated with the network appliances. In contrast, independent claim 1 recites a computer program product including instructions for causing a computer to, *inter alia*, provide geographic information associated with indicia of changes in power status that indicates a geographic location associated with a UPS. Thus, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Ewing.

For at least the reasons stated above with respect to independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-3 and 5-6, which depend from independent claim 1, are patentable over Ewing.

Claim 7 and associated dependent claims

Ewing does not teach, disclose, suggest, or make obvious an apparatus, as recited in claim 7, that includes a processor configured to collect power-status data and associated geographic data received from the remote devices via a communication interface. As discussed above, Ewing discusses providing status information about UPSs located at geographically distant locations. Ewing, however, does not teach, suggest, disclose, or make obvious an apparatus including a processor configured to collect power-status data and associated geographic data received from remote devices, the geographic data indicating geographic locations associated with UPSs as recited by claim 7. Thus, for at least these reasons, claim 7 is patentable over Ewing.

For at least the reasons stated above with respect to independent claim 7, dependent claims 9-12, which depend from independent claim 7, are patentable over Ewing.

Claim 13 and associated dependent claims

Ewing does not teach, disclose, suggest, or make obvious a method, as does claim 13, including receiving, at a plurality of devices, geographic information indicating multiple geographic regions associated with the power-status data. As discussed above, Ewing discusses providing status information about UPSs located at geographically distant locations. Ewing, however, does not teach, suggest, disclose, or make obvious a method including receiving, at a plurality of devices, indicia of power status from multiple UPSs coupled to the devices, the indicia of power status including geographic information indicating multiple geographic regions associated with the power-status data, as does claim 13. Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claim 13 is patentable over Ewing.

For at least the reasons stated above with respect to independent claim 13, dependent claims 15-16 and 18-21, which depend from independent claim 13, are patentable over Ewing.

Claim 22 and associated dependent claims

Ewing does not teach, disclose, suggest, or make obvious a combination of a UPS and a device configured to provide geographic information associated with indicia of changes in power status that indicates a geographic location of the UPS. As discussed above, Ewing discusses providing status information about UPSs located at geographically distant locations. Ewing, however, does not teach, suggest, disclose, or make obvious a combination of a UPS and a device configured to provide geographic information associated with indicia of changes in power status that indicates a geographic location of the UPS, as does claim 22. Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claim 22 is patentable over Ewing.

For at least the reasons stated above with respect to independent claim 22, dependent claims 23-24, which depend from independent claim 22, are patentable over Ewing.

#### **35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections**

Claims 4, 8, 14, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ewing in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,677,894 (Sheynblat).

Claim 4, which depends from independent claim 1, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ewing in view of Sheynblat. The Examiner does not assert that Sheynblat makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to independent claim 1 from which dependent claim 4 depends. Thus, dependent claim 4 is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1.

Claim 8, which depends from independent claim 7, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ewing in view of Sheynblat. The Examiner does not assert that Sheynblat makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to independent claim 7. Thus, dependent claim 8 is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 7.

Claims 14 and 17, which depend from independent claim 13, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ewing in view of Sheynblat. The Examiner does not assert that Sheynblat makes up for the deficiencies noted above with

respect to independent claim 13. Thus, dependent claims 14 and 17 are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 13.

**Additional claims**

Claims 25-30 have been added. Applicants assert that no new matter has been introduced by claims 25-30. Applicants assert that claims 25-30 are patentable, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing, this application is believed to be in allowable condition, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If a telephone conversation with Applicant's representative would help expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (617) 542-6000.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 50-0311, Reference No. 18133-112.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kyle Turley/

---

Shane H. Hunter, Reg. No. 41,858  
Kyle Turley, Reg. No. 57,197  
Attorneys for Applicants  
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS,  
GLOVSKY AND POPEO, PC  
One Financial Center  
Boston, MA 02111  
Tel.: (617) 542-6000  
Fax: (617) 542-2241  
**Customer No. 30623**

Date: June 21, 2006